

VZCZCXYZ0002
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0264/01 0780944
ZNR UUUUU ZZH (CCY ADX0703A15 MSI4051 611)
O 180944Z MAR 08
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1243
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEHGB/AMEMBASSY BAGHDAD
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RHMFIUU/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEASWA/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSA PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000264

SIPDIS

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (ADDED ADDRESSEE)
SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS)
NSC FOR SMITH
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)

SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP UP FOR
WEEK ENDING MARCH 14, 2008

REF: A) THE HAGUE 249 (EC-52 WRAP UP)

This is CWC-12-08.

SUMMARY

[¶1.](#) (SBU) Two events dominated the week of March 10-14 -- Iraq's delivery of its draft initial declaration of its chemical weapons facilities as it joins the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Cuban Ambassador's dramatic delivery of the Non Aligned Movement's preliminary comments on the draft Review Conference report at the eleventh hour of the Working Group's preparations.

[¶2.](#) (U) Less histrionic, but moving steadily forward were consultations on the new format of the OPCW annual budget, an organizational meeting of the Security Audit Team, a meeting of the Validation Group reviewing data for the Central Analytical Database, and a conference call to discuss U.S. concerns with sampling and analysis.

IRAQI DECLARATION

[¶3.](#) (SBU) On March 11, Del received an electronic copy of the most recent version of Iraq's draft initial declaration. The CD-Rom was accompanied by a personal letter from Iraqi Ambassador Banaa indicating that copies were also being provided to the UK and Director General Pfirter, and requesting U.S. feedback. In conversation with Iraqi delegate Jewad, Delrep inquired as to the progress in Iraqi accession; Jewad explained that the CWC law still has to be published in an official gazette before accession can be finalized. Jewad was unsure as to whether Iraq intended to use its full sixty days

between depositing its instrument of accession and submitting its initial declaration.

¶4. (SBU) Later in the week, Del confirmed with Technical Secretariat (TS) Director of Verification Horst Reeps that a U.S./UK/TS review of the declaration would take place March 19-20 in The Hague. Del also requested Reeps inform Japan, as the Japanese have come to expect participation in Iraq-related events after funding several of the Amman workshops.

OEWG: REVIEW CONFERENCE PREPARATION

¶5. (U) On March 13 and 14, Amb. Lyn Parker (UK) chaired two Open Ended Working Group meetings to continue discussing the composite draft report for the Review Conference, since few delegations had commented during the first discussion of the combined text on February 27. Amb. Parker outlined his proposed timeline for the weeks leading up to the RevCon:

- March 17: all text due to the UK delegation for consideration in the revised draft of the Chair's text;
- March 19: the OEWG meeting will discuss and decide how to proceed with consultations in the last two weeks before the RevCon;
- March 20: the next draft of the Chair's text will be sent to the TS for distribution (including translation) for all SPs in advance of the RevCon;
- March 25 onward: informal consultations will likely begin, with the new draft of the Chair's text forming the basis of negotiations;
- March 27: the OEWG meeting will discuss the first draft of the political declaration, to be released the week of March 24;
- April 3: the final OEWG before the RevCon will decide on attendance of observers, update the Chair's report to the RevCon, and look at any outstanding administrative issues.

¶6. (U) The March 13 meeting was dominated by procedural debates and the Cuban Ambassador's announcement on behalf of the NAM States Parties and China that their preliminary comments on the composite text were being posted on the OPCW external server. The Cuban Ambassador called for consultations on the NAM draft to begin as soon as possible, following the "successful" model of the RevCon agenda. The Indian Ambassador, and delegates from Iran, South Africa and China supported early negotiations on the draft text in small groups or "task forces" in order to revise the text, with the Indian Ambassador stating that both the earlier chairman's text and the NAM text should both be distributed to all States Parties and discussed side-by-side. Western delegations supported the chair's plan for a revised text, with possible negotiations of issues or "hot spots" to follow. A variety of views were also expressed on the form and content of the political declaration, with Amb. Parker describing a broad document for the press and public that would emphasize the accomplishments of the organization rather than following the report too closely. The Iranian delegation spoke of a "solemn declaration" as for the NPT and BWC. Chairman Parker welcomed the NAM paper that he had been "awaiting" for some time, and closed the meeting with the

announcement that Friday's session would focus on substance in the report.

17. (SBU) The WEOG met Friday morning (March 14) before the Open Ended Working Group session and discussed tactics on the NAM text. The group generally agreed that the NAM text should not be allowed to dominate the OEWG discussion, and that all would support the chairman's process for a revised draft text. U.S. del noted that the NAM is not a recognized body at the OPCW and that any future discussions of the draft text should be open to all interested parties and negotiated by States Parties, not by groups. Several delegations agreed, with Swedish del noting that questioning the NAM text would force NAM member states to defend it and provide more transparency on how much support any individual change might have. The UK delegation, including a brief appearance by Amb. Parker, requested WEOG support in challenging the NAM text so that the chair would not be forced to include its more egregious points in the revised text.

18. (U) At the reconvening of the Open Ended Working Group on Friday, delegations were remarkably cordial and focused on substance in their interventions. Most commented directly on the chairman's draft (as did the U.S. del), including some delegations that have rarely participated (Turkey, New Zealand). Of the comments on the chairman's text given by delegations, the following were of particular note:

- On the issue of declaration of low concentrations of Schedule 2A chemicals, Canada asked that the draft language be strengthened to express concern with the failure to resolve the issue.

Canada went on to say that they would be proposing Conference decision language that, pending final resolution of the matter, calls for all plant sites with production of Schedule 2A chemicals above the verification threshold, regardless of concentration, to submit declarations. Switzerland, Italy, the UK, Australia, and Sweden echoed this proposal.

- Canada, Switzerland, the UK, and Sweden felt the text regarding advances in science and technology is too narrow, focusing only on the Scientific Advisory Board. They suggested that industry, academia, and other relevant expertise be included.

- Although generally supportive of its use, Australia called for further discussions regarding the regular use of sampling and analysis during routine Schedule 2 inspections. The Netherlands made similar comments.

- The Netherlands called for undertaking challenge inspection exercises in conjunction with the TS in regions outside of Europe.

- The Netherlands called for the need of linking Article XI efforts with national implementation.

- In a surprising move from previous interventions, New Zealand made reference to the DG's paper and its call for further increases in the number of OCPF inspections -- something that is not found in the current text -- and spoke to their nonproliferation value in these rapidly expanding industries.

- As an example of the balancing work ahead, Mexico mentioned how the language on national implementation (text expresses great concern) seems out of balance with that on destruction (text makes no mention of any concern).

¶9. (U) While NAM member states did not raise any of their issues in the discussion, the Cuban Ambassador requested comments on the NAM paper. The Chinese delegation supported the NAM paper but made additional points in their national capacity on abandoned chemical weapons and OCPF inspections. Delegates from Japan, the Netherlands, France and others questioned and commented on the NAM text, with France noting one paragraph (119 on consensus) that they agreed with completely. There already appears to be some backpedaling from the "pledge" on an open agenda that was negotiated and recorded in the report of EC-52. Iran and South Africa both stated more than once that any discussions or small groups meetings between now and the RevCon should occur strictly along the lines of the agreed agenda.

¶10. (U) At the end of the meeting, Amb. Parker returned to discussion of next steps. More voices in the room supported his revised text than argued against it (Iran and India). Several delegations (including the U.S.) spoke in favor of negotiations in small groups or the OEWG before the beginning of the RevCon. Amb. Parker stated that the next working group (March 19) would discuss how to proceed in the time remaining before the Review Conference, and said he would offer a proposal on sequential meetings of smaller groups to discuss the text by topic.

BUDGET CONSULTATIONS

¶11. (U) On March 13, John Freeman (DDG), Ron Nelson (Director, Administration), and Labib Sahab (Head, Budget) chaired a follow-up consultation to the

Budget Informal held just before EC-52 (ref A) to receive delegations' feedback on the proposed new budget format. All delegations generally spoke in support of the changes, with many seeking to insure that key information will be retained in the new format. Iran and South Africa made a pitch for including more information on staffing (e.g., geographical representation); this met with resistance from Korea and the DDG, who both said that the budget should only contain elements with budget implications.

¶12. (U) Many of the points raised by the Del were echoed by other delegations, including Germany, Japan, Korea, and South Africa. In particular, South Africa echoed the U.S. request for a breakdown of budgets within program areas. The DDG said that the TS would aim to do this for the 2010 budget but that

SIPDIS

-- due to time and technical constraints -- it would not be possible for the 2009 budget, which is already in preparation. While Iran indicated it wanted more time to consider the new format, the DDG said that the overwhelmingly positive response from SPs had encouraged the TS use the new format for the 2009 budget document. (Del note: The TS plans to release the DG's proposed budget on June 20, just before EC-53.)

VALIDATION GROUP

¶13. (U) On March 11 and 12, the Validation Group met to review newly proposed analytical data for consideration as additions to the OPCW Central Analytical Database (OCAD). The U.S. participants on the Group -- Armando Alcaraz and Hugh Gregg (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory) -- reported to the Del that the meetings proceeded without difficulty.

Although the basic ideas have been captured in the national papers of several States Parties, the meeting acknowledged the importance of the TS preparing a paper explaining the value of and need for having some data regarding unscheduled chemicals in the OCAD -- e.g., need for analyzing necessary derivatives, value during challenge inspections and cases of alleged use, value for work with old and abandoned chemical weapons, facilitates the work of designated laboratories. This paper would go a long way in responding to the direct call by India (repeated during EC-52) for such a paper and paving the way for quicker approval of newly validated data by the EC in the future.

SECURITY AUDIT TEAM

¶14. (U) The first session of the Fifth Security Audit Team (SAT-V) met during the week. Lisa Von Colln (the U.S. auditor) reported to the Del that she and the other five auditors (representing France, Germany, India, Japan, and the Netherlands) agreed on the mandate for SAT-V. Instead of appointing an overall chair, as had been done for SAT-III and SAT-IV, the audit team decided to rotate responsibility for coordinating each audit among the six auditors. They also tentatively scheduled the first audit for the week of September 22.

SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS

¶15. (U) On March 14, Delrep organized a conference call between ISN/CB and BIS representatives in Washington and Gary Mallard of the OPCW Laboratory in

The Hague. The purpose of the meeting was to help resolve long-standing concerns and questions about various aspects of chemical analysis during Schedule 2 inspections -- e.g., false positives, ramifications of gaps in the OCAD, merits of the use of the analytical software in both the open and closed modes. It is expected that more general discussions with the TS on various sampling and analysis policy matters will happen in the near future.

¶16. (U) Javits sends.

Gallagher